DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 213 CS 210 522

AUTHOR England, Bill; And Others
TITLE Cigarette Advertising: My, How You've Changed!
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advertising; Content Analysis; Federal Regulation; Media Research; *Periodicals; *Persuasive Discourse; Public Opinion; *Smoking
IDENTIFIERS *Advertisements; Media History

ABSTRACT

A study examined the changes that have occurred in the content of cigarette advertising in magazines from 1945 to 1985 in the context of changes in the product itself, in advertising science, and in government regulation. Specifically, the study examined how advertisements had changed in terms of format, brand segmentation, major sales point or theme, and content. Cigarette advertisements appearing in 18 different magazines from 1945, 1955, 1965, 1972 and 1985 were coded, for a total of 352 ads from a variety of magazine formats: news, feature, men's, women's, sports, and popular culture. The results indicated that advertisements have changed a great deal in these four areas. Current ads run the gamut from a stress on product attributes to an emphasis on lifestyle and image-related themes. Ads have moved toward the full-page four-color pictorial with a people-dominant message. The most significant change has been a steady reduction in the copy block as advertisers have turned toward less copy-intensive image appeals. Brand segmentation based on length, filter, menthol and packaging has also increased. The taste/flavor appeal has shifted to an image appeal portrayed as part of enjoying a social situation or lifestyle. "Men doing things" has been the dominant category of content, even in ads in women's magazines. Ads showing both men and women have become more frequent, while those showing product usage have decreased in frequency. (Tables of data and notes are included, and the content analysis score sheet is appended.) (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED284213

Cigarette Advertising: My, How You've Changed!

by

Bill England
New Mexico State University

Steve Pasternack
New Mexico State University

Sandra H. Utt
Memphis State University

Submitted to the open papers competition of the Advertising Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, March 30, 1987.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra H. Utt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS210522

Although the first known display advertisement for tobacco appeared during the 18th century,[1] cigarette advertising as it is known today began in the years surrounding World War I. The history of cigarette advertising has been dotted with incredible claims by manufacturers and a heavy dose of regulatory activity by the government. Today, 16 years after cigarette commercials were barred from radio and television, Congress is considering legislation aimed at either severely restricting--or even totally banning-- tobacco advertising.[2] The stakes are quite high: tobacco firms now spend more than $2 billion per year on advertising and promotion.

Long before the broadcast ban or surgeon general reports,[3] cigarette advertising was arousing controversy. As far back as 1917, Kansas prohibited the circulation of any newspaper containing cigarette advertising.[4] Although that legislative effort was later invalidated,[5] it perhaps set the stage for a turbulent 60-year span involving the tobacco industry, the government, the media and public interest groups.

Essentially, the government has wielded three types of weapons in its ongoing battle with tobacco advertisers: of course, most severe of all is the outright banning of such advertisements. But, throughout the last 60 years, the government has drastically altered what tobacco companies may say or show in their advertising through a long list of cease and desist orders, stipulations, and consent decrees involving individual manufacturers and industry-wide regulations and suggestions for all

tobacco firms which advertise.

An in-depth discussion of the efforts to ban cigarette advertising is beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless, a brief review of the events leading to the broadcast ban--and a look at its impact is necessary. Five years after Great Britain banned cigarette advertising from television,[6] the U.S. Congress passed the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1970, which prohibited cigarette commercials on either radio or television effective Jan. 2, 1971. The ban's effect was immediate and noticeable. In 1970, cigarette advertising totalled $315 million on advertising, with 68 percent of that spent on television; for 1971, the total dropped to $252 million, with 39 percent going to magazine advertising.[7] This shift is reflected by examining the first three issues of Time magazine for both 1970 and 1971; in 1970, the magazine's first three issues totalled about the equivalent of 8 full pages of cigarette advertising. For 1971, it jumped to about 21 full pages.[8] In fact, between 1970 and 1971, tobacco companies quadrupled their newspaper advertising expenditure, doubled it for magazines and increased it about sixfold for outdoor.[9]

Before the government prohibited broadcast cigarette advertising, several media outlets had already decided to do so on their own. For example, the Boston Globe refused to accept cigarette advertising from 1969-74,[10] and neither the Christian Science Monitor[11] nor Reader's Digest[12] has ever run such ads. When the New York Times required

tobacco advertisers in the late 1960s to include certain health-related warnings in their advertisements, the newspaper lost three tobacco accounts.[13] Currently it is estimated that six dailies in the United States and three in Canada do not accept cigarette advertising.[14] And, while some advertising agencies have refused to handle cigarette accounts,[15] a survey showed few "pangs" of conscience among cigarette account copywriters over producing copy for a harmful product.[16]

The earliest cigarette advertising campaigns lacked the outrageous health claims which would generate controversy for three decades and ultimately lead to government restriction and censorship. For example, in 1914, Camel cigarettes predicted in an advertisement: "Tomorrow there will be more Camels in this town than in Asia and Africa combined."[17] In the early 1920s, manufacturers were busily trying to target women as a potential market;[18] increasingly, women began appearing in cigarette advertisements. By, the late 1920s, slogans such as "Reach for a Lucky Instead of a Sweet" and "Blow Some My Way" made it clear that women's role in cigarette advertising and marketing had grown significantly. By the 1930s, with few noticeable differences in packaging, promotion or taste, advertising emerged as the industry's major competitive device; and, in a laissez-faire marketplace, the claims of some cigarette advertisers tested the limits of the imagination

Manufacturers resorted to claims such as their brand as a treatment for asthma[19] to reductions in throat irrit-

irritation.[20] Tobacco companies found themselves before the Federal Trade Commission quite often, mainly for two categories of alleged deception: false medical claims and either fake or unauthorized testimonials.

For example, in one 1929 case, a well-known actress who did not smoke "claimed" in a cigarette advertisement that smoking a certain brand kept her slender. In the same FTC case, the agency requested a halt to a comedian's testimonial that smoking freed him of all irritants and even[21] kept his voice clear. Other early medical and health-related claims included: improved digestion, relief from fatigue and comforted nerves,[22] cigarettes which are safe for the throat or lungs[23] and suggestions that certain brands were "de-nicotinized."[24] It was claims such as these which led one observer to call the tobacco industry the major abuser of the right of free speech.[25] Indeed, once the hard-to-believe claims subsided, tobacco advertisers still made claims such as "More doctors smoke Camel than any other cigarette."[26]

By the 1950s, as evidence began to suggest a link between smoking and certain illnesses, the government began to issue a variety of industry-wide directives and suggested guidelines. In 1954, the FTC suggested to tobacco advertisers that they stop claiming their products are either beneficial to health or non-irritating.[27] By 1960, the FTC had succeeded in getting tobacco companies to voluntarily remove all health claims,[28] thus ushering in

the era of advertisements touting taste and flavor rather than good health.

While most cigarette advertisements were not deceptive, the fact remains that unfounded or questionable claims were relatively common in cigarette advertisements until the 1950s. In the early 1950s, for example, advertisers claimed their brand had the largest number of "exclusive" smokers,[29] that their brand's cigarettes could be smoked either dry or moist,[30] and that a cigarette's oval shape and extra length made it smoke cooler.[31]

Throughout the early 1960s, the FTC continued to change the appearance and content of cigarette advertisements. It got advertisers to agree, for example, to stop claiming that smoking enhances social prominence, sexual attraction or success.[32] Thus ended commercials such as the "Chesterfield Panel of Distinguished Smokers." Manufacturers, faced with a degree of government arm-twisting, agreed also to stop creating ads using celebrity testimonials (such as the advertisement with Arnold Palmer on the green with a cigarette in his mouth) or those showing people in activities requiring stamina.[33]

However, it was mounting scientific evidence rather than false or deceptive advertising claims which led the government to require a warning statement from the Surgeon General on cigarette packages in the 1960s and in all advertisements in the early 1970s. What began as a rather mild "caution" statement a generation ago has[34]

evolved[35] into an array of four highly specific warnings today.[36]

Despite all the controversy surrounding cigarette advertising, there have been few systematic studies of the content of the ads. A 1981 study of 251 magazine advertisements published in 1957, 1967 and 1977 found that by 1977 cigarette ads were taking up more space, moving to both back and double pages, and that low tar content had begun to replace "taste" and "social appeal" as an overriding theme. The researchers also found that by 1977, human models were appearing less and less--being replaced by packages of cigarettes.[37] A study of 303 cigarette advertisements found a shift by 1980 to the "pleasure" of smoking and less emphasis on taste or tar content. In fact, the researcher found, the ads were focusing on mood and emotion more often, with fewer explicit appeals than in years past.[38]

Perhaps the largest concern today regarding cigarette advertising is whether it gets non-smokers to start smoking. The Carlton cigarettes campaign, "If you smoke, please try Carlton" underscores the tobacco industry's efforts to convince the public and Congress that cigarette advertising is designed "to prompt smokers to switch brands or to keep them loyal to the brand they already smoke."[39] One study of 12 brands found very little difference among them and concluded advertising was the key to determining

brand selection.[40] In the 1970s, researchers found that the court-ordered anti-smoking messages on television contributed to the lessening of smoking more than cigarette commercials had encouraged it.[41][42]

Purpose of the Paper

The purpose of this paper is to examine changes which have occurred in cigarette advertising in magazines over the last 40 years. The changes will be explored in the context of changes in the cigarette product itself, changes in advertising and shifts in government regulation of cigarette advertising.

Research Questions

The research questions are:

1. From 1945 to 1985, how did the format of cigarette advertisements in magazines change? Format refers to color, copy blocks, ad size, and use of photos or artwork.

2. How did brand segmentation in cigarette advertising in magazines change from 1945-1985?

3. How did the major sales point or theme of cigarette advertisements in magazines change from 1945 to 1985?

4. Between 1945 and 1985 how did the content of cigarette advertisements in magazines change in terms of the presence of people, cigarette packages and activities portrayed?

Method

Cigarette advertisements appearing in 18 different magazines from 1945, 1955, 1965, 1972 and 1985 (see Appendix A) were coded as part of this content analysis. All of the advertisements (in both weekly and monthly publications) during the month of April were included in the sample. April was purposively selected because media budgets would be high and many magazines' scheduling pulses omit the summer months.

The magazines were: Time, Newsweek, Esquire, Playboy, Ebony, Field & Stream, Life, Ms., Essence, Rolling Stone, Mademoiselle, Redbook, Ladies Home Journal, GQ, Popular Mechanics, Savvy, Sports Illustrated and Working Women.

The years were selected as follows:

1945 was chosen to represent the period prior to widespread governmental action of the cigarette advertising industry.

1955 was chosen to represent the year after the Federal Trade Commission's first successful attempt at limiting health claims in cigarette advertisements by way of suggested guidelines to tobacco advertisers.

1965 was chosen as the year following the first report of the Surgeon General, the year Congress passed legislation requiring warning statements on cigarette packages and a period generally perceived as a time of "appeal shift" in cigarette advertising.

1972 was selected as the first full year of print advertising following the broadcast ban.

1985 was selected to represent the current themes and content of cigarette advertising.

The Sample

In all, 352 magazine advertisements for cigarettes were content analyzed. Of those ads, 36.9 percent were from 1985, 39.8 percent from 1972, 13.4 percent from 1965, 6 percent from 1955 and 4 percent from 1945. While there are

more cigarette advertisements today, it must be pointed out that the above percentages are partly due to the fact that only 9 of the 18 magazines studied were published as far back as 1945.

Overall, 48.3 percent of the advertisements were in general interest/news publications, 30.4 percent were in men's magazines and 21.3 percent were in women's magazines.

Findings

In terms of format, 84.1 percent of the advertisements consumed a full page. Most of the ads (88.4 percent) included a photograph, while 21.9 percent included some artwork. More than four in five ads (84.1 percent) were published in 4-color and 57.7 percent ran headlines without copy.

The changes between 1945 and the present in terms of format are readily apparent. For example, in 1945, 92.9 percent of the ads studied used a copy block in addition to a headline/subhead. That percentage has dropped each decade. In 1955, it fell to 85.7 percent and by 1965, it was 66 percent. By 1972, the percentage was 46.4 percent and in 1985 it had fallen to 16.9 percent.

Four-color has gradually increased over the years in cigarette advertising, reflecting its increased usage elsewhere in magazines. While 57.1 percent of the cigarette ads were four-color in 1945, the percentage reached 87.7 percent by 1985. However, it must be noted that the majority of the four-color ads in the 1940s and 1950s were either the

inside front, inside back or back cover rather than elsewhere in the magazine. Meanwhile, cigarette advertisements in black and white have virtually disappeared, falling from 21.4 percent in 1945 to none in 1985.

There were no noticeable trends in photo or artwork usage. However, more (50 percent) full-page bleed photos appeared in 1985 than less-than-full-page photos (39.2 percent).

While the full page cigarette advertisment has become the industry standard, the double-page spread is growing in popularity. Unheard of prior to the 1970s, and rare even in 1972 (2.9 percent of the ads studied from that year were double spreads), in 1985, 17.7 percent of the cigarette advertisements were double page spreads.

Not only has the ads' format changed, they have also grown diverse in terms of brand segmentation, reflecting a tobacco industry trend toward various categories of cigarettes under one brand heading. All of the ads examined from 1945 were for regular tobacco. By 1955, with the arrival of filter cigarettes, advertisments were already almost equally divided between regular tobacco cigarettes (47.6 percent) and filter (42.9 percent). By 1965, filter cigarettes represented 48.9 percent of the advertisements and regular cigarettes fell to less than one-fourth (23.4 percent). In 1965, the industry had segmented its brands into low tar, menthol and length of cigarette categorizations.

Regular tobacco continued its advertising decline

in 1972 to 7.1 percent, as cigarette advertising turned more heavily to menthol, length, low tar, filter and combination ads with more than one type of cigarette. In 1985, brand segmentation once again exhibited an increase in low tar and combination, while regular, menthol, length and filter all declined (see Table 1).

Meanwhile, the appeals within cigarette ads changed remarkably over the 40-year period studied. A close examination of the trends suggests that what advertisers chose as sales points in 1945--testimonials and good quality tobacco--had disappeared by 1985; conversely, the modern product attributes of low tar, filter and product length--unheard of 40 years ago--play a significant role today in tobacco advertising. Also, the less tangible claim of smoking "adds to your life" now accounts for the appeal in two of every five cigarette advertisements. One constant theme over the 40-year period, albeit in varying percentages: a cigarette's good taste (see Table 2).

As might be expected, a change in advertising sales points has been reflected in changes in content. While cigarette advertisements have been photographed everywhere from the wild west to a busy urban street, there have been changes in the categories of content included. Overall, 54.8 percent of the ads studied ran people (photo or artwork) as the dominant element in the advertisement.

Meanwhile, 39.2 percent of the ads included men only, 28.7 percent included men and women, and 9.1 percent included

Table 1

Brand Segmentation by Year

Year	Regular Tobacco	Menthol	Length	Filter	Low Tar	Combo
1945	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1955	47.6%	4.8%	0%	42.9%	0%	4.8%
1965	23.4%	12.8%	8.5%	48.9%	6.4%	0%
1972	7.1%	17.1%	15%	39.3%	12.1%	9.3%
1985	5.4%	11.5%	9.2%	18.5%	37.7%	17.7%

Table 2

Major Sales Point by Year

Year	Testimonal	Enjoyment	Low Tar	Good Taste	Filter	Length	Good Tobacco	Adds to Life
1945	71.4%	0%	0%	7.1%	0%	0%	21.4%	0%
1955	19.0%	14.3%	0%	33.3%	23.8%	0%	4.8%	0%
1965	6.4%	4.3%	6.4%	57.4%	12.8%	0%	8.5%	0%
1972	0%	8.6%	15%	39.3%	11.4%	8.6%	2.9%	12.9%
1985	0	9.2%	24.6%	20.8%	5.4%	2.3%	0%	31.5%

women only. The product alone appeared in 18.5 percent of the ads, while 4.5 percent included neither the product nor people. More than half of the advertisements (68.2 percent) portrayed a cigarette being used in some manner. Generally, "product only" and "no people/no product" advertisements have increased over the years from virtual non-existence in 1945 and 1955 to 16.2 percent (product only) and 8.5 percent (no people/no product) by 1985. In both men's and general interest/news magazines, advertisements featuring "men doing something" (having fun, working, reading, e.g.) has been the dominant content category. Overall, 52.3 percent of all cigarette ads analyzed in men's magazines showed men doing something; the same held true for 40 percent of the ads in general interest/news and 18.7 percent in women's magazines.

Advertisements showing "men and women doing something" have appeared relatively equally in women's magazines (33.3 percent), general interest magazines (30 percent) and men's magazines (23.4 percent). The category of "women doing things" has appeared in 25.3 percent of the ads in women's magazines, 6.5 percent of general/news magazines and 1.9 percent of men's magazines.

Product usage, defined as anyone in an advertisement holding a cigarette, has declined from a peak of 90 percent in 1955 to 60 percent in 1985. Also, the tone of the usage has changed from the obvious--having a lit cigarette in the model's mouth or smoke coming out of the model's nose or

mouth--to someone holding a cigarette much like they might hold a pen. While holding the cigarette, the model is generally reading, rounding up a herd of cattle or having lunch in a yuppie-style restaurant. Product usage in 1945, 1955 and 1965 ranged from 78.6 percent to 90 percent, and invariably included a model smoking. In 1972, and to a greater extent, 1985, the model was likely doing something else and chances are the cigarette was not even lit.

Discussion

Cigarette advertising, like most advertising, has changed drastically over the last 40 years. While the most ostensible change was the 1971 broadcast ban, in fact, print advertising has seen massive increases in expenditures and brand segmentation as well as changes in sales pitch, content and format.

Of course, any discussion of changes in cigarette advertising must be viewed in the context of the government regulations imposed---from the required warning statements to the removal of all health-related claims by the manufacturers.

To be sure, the cigarette advertisements of the pre-regulation era, replete with outrageous health-related claims, are a relic of the past.

Advertising creatives may perceive that they have been boxed into a corner and left with limited options. And, with a possible ban on all cigarette advertising having been proposed, is it no wonder that the industry--as reflected by its advertisements--is treading on eggs?

Today, cigarette advertising in magazines runs the gamut from a stress on product attributes to an emphasis on lifestyle and image-related themes. For example, the Carlton advertisements ("If you smoke, please try Carlton") are clearly aimed at an already-smoking consumer with the goal of creating brand switching or loyalty via an emphas s on the product attribute of low tar content. By contrast, ads for Camel featuring the "Camel man," can be seen as directed at both smokers (to get them to switch) and at non-smokers (to get them to convert), using the lifestyle appeal.

While the tobacco industry maintains today that cigarette advertising is aimed at creating brand loyalty and brand switching, the fact remains that the increased use of lifestyle-related themes cannot help but have some influence on non-users, as those advertisements tend to emphasize the pleasure of smoking as part of a desirable lifestyle rather than the advantages of any particular brand of cigarettes.

The content analysis found that cigarette advertising has changed in the following four areas: format, brand segmentation, sales points and content.

In terms of format, cigarette ads have followed the classic national image advertising magazine approach: a move toward the full page, 4-color pictorial with a people-dominant message. The most significant change

has been a steady reduction in the copy block because manufacturers have chosen to include less specific information about product attributes and have turned instead toward less-copy-intensive image appeals. Beyond that, cigarette advertisers are purchasing more double-page spreads--and even cover gatefolds--to attract attention in the cluttered magazine environment.

In terms of brand segmentation, the proliferation of brands into sub-brands (based on length, filter, menthol, packaging, etc.) is an obvious marketing competitive strategy to appeal to various customer needs. Brand segmentation may have grown out of increasing health concerns and government watchdog activities, resulting in such innovative segments as filters, menthol and low tar. The 1985 figures reflect an increase in low-tar-related ads and a reduction in ads for all other segments.

In terms of sales points, taste/flavor has become harder to sell as a benefit to a public increasingly concerned with health and bombarded with warnings of the dangers of smoking. So, taste/flavor has shifted to an image appeal in most advertisements and is portrayed as part of enjoying a social situation or lifestyle. Sales points concerning product attributes have become more specific simply because product attributes have become more specific over the years. Image appeals have become less specific as testimonials by people have given way to lifestyle themes.

In relation to content, "men doing things" has been

the dominant category, and has been a frequent element even in ads in women's magazines. Ads showing both men and women have become more frequent, while those showing product usage have decreased in frequency. Evidently cigarette companies and/or their creatives have decided that smoke, touching the cigarette to the lips, or having it lit are distasteful. Male-oriented brands such as Camel and Marlboro show actual smoking, and tend to use image appeals featuring rugged adventure or risky situations. By contrast, Winston ads tend to show risky situations such as helicopter flying without the model smoking. Female-oriented brands tend to feature successful, independent women. Product-only and no-people/no-product (typographic only) ads (such as Carlton's) have increased.

Notes

1. Wood, James P. The story of advertising. New York: Ronald Press, 1958, p. 371.

2. "Ad regulation in the 100th Congress." AAF Washington Report. January 1987. The proposals include restricting cigarette advertisements to a "tombstone format" or an outright ban on all tobacco ads. Congress' authority may have been fortified by a 1986 Supreme Court ruling which upheld a government's authority to institute a ban on advertising for a legal product or service. See Posadas de Puerto Rico Associates v. Tourism Company of Puerto Rico, 13 Med. L. Reptr. 1033 (1986).

3.In the 1920s, a temperance-prohibition group called on Congress to ban all cigarette advertising on moral, rather than health, grounds. "Asks curb on cigarettes." New York Times, Sept. 23, 1929, 21:5.

4. "Kansas bans cigarette advertising." New York Times Feb. 9, 1917, 20:3.

5. "Validates cigarette 'ad'. New York Times July 10, 1927, 23:2.

6. "A smokeless screen." Time Feb. 19, 1965, 85, 94-95.

7. Federal Trade Commission Report to Congress Pursuant to the Federal Cigarette Labelling and Advertising Act. Washington: Federal Trade Commission, 1986.

8. Whiteside, Thomas. Selling death. New York: Liveright, 1970, p. 120.

9. Walter, Norma. The medium is not the message. The Exchange, March 1972, 33, p. 15.

10. Boston Globe Reverses Stand on Cigarette Ads. Wall Street Journal, §May 28, 1974, 10:3. The Globe had instituted its no-cigarette ad policy in 1969.

11. Whiteside, note 8, p. 102.

12. Why we accept cigarette ads. Business and Society Review. Winter 1977-78, 24, pp. 60-63.

13. Smokeless media. The Economist, Sept. 20, 1969, 232, p. 49. The Times required health warning statements in cigarette ads it published two years before the government required warning statements in cigarette ads.

14. Blum, Alan. The great tobacco ad ban debate. The Quill. December 1986, pp. 17-28. The most recent publication to ban

cigarette advertising was the Toronto Globe and Mail in 1986. In Canada, the issue reached the point in one city where the city council fell one vote short of asking the local newspaper to stop running cigarette advertisements.

15. Whiteside, note 8, p. 74, reported that Doyle, Dane, Bernbach and Ogilvy and Mather do not accept cigarette accounts.

16. Bowen, Croswell. Cigarettes and the ad men. New Republic, May 9, 1964, 150, p. 6.

17. Wood, note 1, p. 373.

18. Abrams, Bill and Guyon, Janet. Lorillard tries to lure women with a satin cigarette fantasy. Wall Street Journal, Feb. 17, 1983, 33:1.

19. 17 FTC Reports 597 (1933). Stipulation.

20. In the matter of American Tobacco Co., 47 FTC Reports 1393 (1951). Cease and desist order.

21. 13 FTC Reports 435 (1929). Stipulation.

22. In the matter of R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., 46 FTC Reports 706 (1950). Cease and desist order.

23. 46 FTC Reports 1240 (1950). Stipulation.

24. 12 FTC Reports 640 (1929). Stipulation.

25. Tye, Joe B. Cigarette ads reveal a history of deceit. Wall Street Journal, August 5, 1986, 30:3.

26. Tye, note 25.

27. New rules for cigarettes. Time Sept. 27, 1954, 64, p. 92. These "rules" actually urged a halt to any claims mentioning parts of the body, digestion, nerves or doctors. Two years prior, the FTC unsuccessfully attempted to get a court order stopping health claims in cigarette ads when a federal court ruled that cigarettes did not qualify as a drug.

28. Back to the old pitch. Newsweek, Feb. 15, 1960, 55, pp. 73-74.

29. In the matter of American Tobacco Co., 47 FTC Reports 1393 (1951). Here, the complained of advertisement represented that among independent tobacco experts, Lucky Strike had more than two times as many "exclusive" smokers as all other brands combined.

30. 46 FTC Reports 1230 (1950). Stipulation.

31. 47 FTC Reports 1726 (1951). Stipulation.

32. Smoke-filled code. Newsweek, May 11, 1964, 63, p. 72.

33. Id. The voluntary move by the tobacco manufacturers was widely interpreted as an attempt to forestall health warning statements on cigarette packages.

34. The original statement, required on packages in 1965, stated: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health." The words, amended in 1971 and then required in advertisements as well, were changed to: "Warning: The Surgeon General Has Determined That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health."

35. In 1972, the FTC, in a consent order, required the six major tobacco manufacturers to include a "clear and conspicuous" disclosure of the surgeon general's statement in advertisements. The FTC order specified the statement's type size range, shape, background and, to a degree, its location within the advertisement. See In the matter of P. Lorillard, Philip Morris Inc., American Brands Inc., Brown and Williamson Tobacco Corp., R.J. Reynolds, Liggett & Myers Inc., 80 FTC Reports 455 (1972).

36. In 1984, President Reagan signed to Comprehensive Smoking Education Act which required four specified warnings, on a rotating basis, in all advertisements except billboards. The statements are still in use today.

37. Weinberger, Marc G., Campbell, Leland and DuGrenier, F. Douglas. Cigarette advertising: Tactical changes in the pre and post broadcast era. In H. Keith Hunt, ed. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the American Academy of Advertising, 1981, 136-141.

38. Abrams, Bill. Touting smoking pleasure. Wall Street Journal, March 12, 1981, 33:1.

39. That quote, from Blum (note 14), is from the chairman of the Tobacco Institute.

40. Horsky, Dan. Market share response to advertising: An example of theory testing. Journal of Marketing Research, February 1977, 14, 10-21.

41. In Banzhaf v FCC, a federal appeals court upheld an FCC requirement that anti-smoking messages be permitted on stations broadcasting cigarette advertisements as a requirement under the Fairness Doctrine. 405 F2d 1082 (D.C. Cir., 1968).

42. Hamilton, J.L. The demand for cigarettes: Advertising, the health scare and the cigarette advertising ban. Review of Economic Statistics. 1972, 54, pp. 401-411.

APPENDIX A

Cigarette Content Analysis

Directions: Circle appropriate numbers, except where you must write in.

Brand _____

Cols.1-5/ Magazine (see list for proper coding) (This will be five numbers. First two numbers are for the magazine. Last three numbers are for the individual ads.)

_____

Col. 6 / Decade
- 1940s (1)
- 1950s (2)
- 1960s (3)
- 1970s (4)
- 1980s (5)

Col. 7/ Magazine type
- Men's (1)
- Women's (2)
- General interest/News (3)

Col. 8/ Differentiation
- regular tobacco (1)
- methol (2)
- length (3)
- filter (4)
- packaging (5)
- low tar (lights) (6)
- combination (7)

Col. 9/ Format
- less than full page (1)
- full page (2)
- double page spread (3)

Col. 10/ Photo
- full page bleed (1)
- less than full page (2)
- no photo (3)

Col. 11/Artwork
- full page (1)
- less than full page (2)
- no artwork (3)

Col. 12/Color
- 4-color (1)
- spot color (2)
- no color (3)

Col. 13/Photo/artwork content

men doing things	(1)
women doing things	(2)
men and women doing things	(3)
product package only	(4)
no product package/no people	(5)

Col. 14/Product usage shown

Yes	(1)
No	(2)

Col. 15/Copy format

Headlines (and subheads)	(1)
Headlines (and subheads), copy	(2)

Cols. 16-17/Major sales point

Testimonal	
Enjoyment/pleasure of smoking	(1)
Give as gift	(2)
Low tar/nicotine	(3)
Good exciting taste	(4)
How product works (filter)	(5)
Length	(6)
Good tobacco	(7)
Best cigarette (scientific research)	(8)
Packaging	(9)
Smoking cigarettes adds to your life (adventure, sex, fun)	(10)
	(11)

Col. 18/Warning label position

Lower right	(1)
Lower left	(2)
Lower middle	(3)
Upper right	(4)
Upper left	(5)
Upper middle	(6)
No warning label	(7)

Col. 19/Dominant element

Headline	(1)
People (photo/artwork)	(2)
Product (photo/artwork)	(3)
Copy	(4)

Col. 20/Audience involvement

Low or none	(1)
High	(2)